arXiv:1003.4873v3 [math.AG] 14 Feb 2012

Finiteness and duality for elliptic pairs over $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$

David Raimundo [*]

February 15, 2012

Abstract

We extend the results of Schapira and Schneiders [14] on relative regularity and finiteness of elliptic pairs to the framework of $\mathscr{D}[[\hbar]]$-modules and $\mathbb{R}$-constructible sheaves of $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$-modules. We also construct a relative duality morphism for elliptic pairs in the smooth case and we prove that it is an isomorphism if the elliptic pair satisfies the finiteness criteria.

Introduction

The notion of elliptic pair goes back to [14], where the authors consider a morphism of complex analytic manifolds $f : X \to Y$ and say that a coherent $\mathscr{D}_X$-module $\mathscr{M}$ and an $\mathbb{R}$-constructible sheaf F form an f-elliptic pair if the f-characteristic variety of $\mathscr{M}$ and the micro-support of F do not intersect outside the zero-section of the cotangent bundle T^*X. The f-characteristic variety of a coherent $\mathscr{D}_X$-module is a closed conic analytic subvariety of the cotangent bundle T^*X, which depends on f. In particular, the f-characteristic variety coincides with the classical characteristic variety when f is the constant map $X \to \{\mathrm{pt}\}$.

If X is the complexification of a real analytic manifold M and if $\mathscr{M}$ is an elliptic system on M, then $(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{C}_M)$ forms an elliptic pair. Therefore, elliptic pairs can be regarded as a generalization of elliptic systems. The functorial properties of f-elliptic pairs are studied in detail in [14], where the authors prove theorems of regularity, finiteness and duality for these objects. As the authors point out, such theorems generalize several classical results of $\mathscr{D}_X$-module theory, complex analytic geometry and elliptic systems theory.

The main purpose of this paper is to extend the notions and main results of [14] to the framework of modules over the ring $\mathscr{D}_X[[\hbar]]$, the ring of differential operators with a formal parameter $\hbar$. This ring appeared first in [8] where the authors deal with deformation-quantization modules over complex manifolds. The study of $\mathscr{D}_X[[\hbar]]$-modules was then developed in [1] and [10]. Consider the

---

[*] The research of the author was supported by Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia and by Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian (Programa Estímulo à Investigação).
Mathematics Subject Classification: 35A27, 32C38

graduate functor $\mathrm{gr}_\hbar$ that maps each F in the derived category of sheaves of $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$-modules to $\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(F) := F \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}_X[[\hbar]]} \mathbb{C}_X$, which one regards as an object of the derived category of sheaves of $\mathbb{C}$-modules.

In this work we introduce the notion of f-elliptic pair over $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ in a natural way, such that, if $\mathscr{M}$ is a coherent $\mathscr{D}_X[[\hbar]]$-module and F is an $\mathbb{R}$-constructible sheaf of $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$-modules, then $(\mathscr{M}, F)$ is an f-elliptic pair over $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ if and only if $(\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{M}), \mathrm{gr}_\hbar(F))$ is an elliptic pair in the sense of [14]. With this definition, we are able to prove theorems of regularity, finiteness and duality for f-elliptic pairs over $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$ by reducing the proofs to the results of loc. cit.

Let us explain with more detail our main results.

In Theorems 3.1 and 3.7 we prove regularity properties for f-elliptic pairs over $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$. These regularity theorems generalize a classical regularity property of elliptic systems in the real analytic setting: the complex of real analytic solutions of an elliptic system coincides with the complex of hyperfunctions solutions.

The proper direct image functor $\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}$ in the framework of $\mathscr{D}_X[[\hbar]]$-modules is introduced in [10]. Using such functor and also the regularity theorem, we are able to prove the finiteness theorem (Theorem 3.9). The statement is the following: given an f-elliptic pair $(\mathscr{M}, F)$, such that f is proper when restricted to $\mathrm{supp}(\mathscr{M}) \cap \mathrm{supp}(F)$ and such that $\mathscr{M}$ is good, then the cohomologies of the direct image $\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(\mathscr{M} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X[[\hbar]]} F)$ are coherent over $\mathscr{D}_Y[[\hbar]]$.

The duality theorem relates the direct image functor with the duality functor, denoted by $\underline{\mathrm{D}}_{\hbar,X}$, in the $\mathscr{D}_X[[\hbar]]$-modules framework. However, to obtain such relation we need to restrict ourselves to the smooth case (which, even so, enable us to treat the case of a constant map). Indeed, two fundamental properties hold if f is a smooth morphism: firstly, the transfer module used in the $\hbar$-setting is coherent over $\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar$; secondly, the extension rings $f^{-1}(\mathscr{D}_X[[\hbar]])$ and $(f^{-1}\mathscr{D}_X)[[\hbar]]$ are isomorphic. More precisely, we prove that if f is smooth, then it is possible to construct a morphism

$$\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(\mathrm{D}'_\hbar F \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X[[\hbar]]} \underline{\mathrm{D}}_{\hbar,X}\mathscr{M}) \to \underline{\mathrm{D}}_{\hbar,Y} \underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(\mathscr{M} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X[[\hbar]]} F). \tag{*}$$

Moreover, if $(\mathscr{M}, F)$ is an f-elliptic pair over $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ in the conditions of the finiteness theorem, then (*) is an isomorphism of complexes of $\mathscr{D}_Y[[\hbar]]$-modules with coherent cohomologies (cf. Theorem 3.20).

In the last section, we study particular cases of the main theorems. Namely, we obtain finiteness and duality results for the complex of global solutions of a coherent $\mathscr{D}_X[[\hbar]]$-module and also a refinement in the holonomic case (cf. Proposition 4.12). We also state finiteness and duality theorems for $\mathscr{O}_X^\hbar$-modules and discuss those theorems in view of our results. Finally, in the case where X is the complexification of a real analytic manifold M, we obtain regularity, finiteness and duality properties concerning the sheaves of formal analytic functions and formal hyperfunctions.

Acknowledgments. We thank Pierre Schapira for proposing the subject of this paper and for making useful remarks and suggestions. We thank Teresa Monteiro Fernandes for her supervision, helpful discussions and constant incentive. We also thank Ana Rita Martins for her comments.

Notations and conventions

In what concerns the language of categories and sheaves, we follow the notations of [6]. Namely, if $\mathscr{R}$ is a sheaf of rings on a topological space, we denote by $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathscr{R})$ the category of left $\mathscr{R}$-modules and by $\mathsf{D}^*(\mathscr{R})$ the derived category $\mathsf{D}^*(\mathrm{Mod}(\mathscr{R}))$ $(* = +, -, \mathrm{b})$. If $\mathscr{R}$ is coherent, we denote by $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{R})$ the full abelian subcategory of $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathscr{R})$ of coherent objects and by $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{R})$ the full triangulated subcategory of $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{R})$ of objects with coherent cohomology groups.

We denote by $\{\mathrm{pt}\}$ the zero-dimensional manifold consisting of a point and by $a_X : X \to \{\mathrm{pt}\}$ the constant map. If R is a noetherian ring, identified to a sheaf of rings over $\{\mathrm{pt}\}$, we write $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_f(R)$ instead of $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(R)$.

In the sequel, when the base ring is $\mathbb{C}$ we may omit it. Namely, we shall write $F \otimes G$ and $\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om\,(F, G)$ instead of $F \otimes_{\mathbb{C}_X} G$ and $\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathbb{C}_X}(F, G)$, respectively.

We denote by $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$ the ring $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ of formal power series with complex coefficients and by $\mathbb{C}^{\hbar,\mathrm{loc}}$ the field $\mathbb{C}((\hbar))$ of Laurent series with complex coefficients.

1 Preliminaries

In this section X denotes a topological space, $\mathscr{R}_0$ denotes a sheaf of $\mathbb{C}_X$-algebras on X and we set $\mathscr{R} := \mathscr{R}_0[[\hbar]] = \Pi_{n\geq 0}\mathscr{R}_0\hbar^n$.

Formal extensions. Consider the functor

$$\begin{array}{rcl} (\,\bullet\,)^\hbar : \mathrm{Mod}(\mathscr{R}_0) & \to & \mathrm{Mod}(\mathscr{R}) \\ \mathscr{N} & \to & \mathscr{N}^\hbar := \mathscr{N}[[\hbar]] = \varprojlim\limits_{n\geq 0}(\mathscr{N} \otimes_{\mathscr{R}_0} \mathscr{R}/\hbar^{n+1}\mathscr{R}). \end{array} \tag{1.1}$$

For an open subset $U \subset X$, a section $f \in \Gamma(U; \mathscr{N}^\hbar)$ can be regarded as a formal power series $f = \sum_{n\geq 0} f_n \hbar^n$ with each $f_n \in \Gamma(U; \mathscr{N})$. The functor $(\,\bullet\,)^\hbar$ is left exact and one denotes by $(\,\bullet\,)^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}$ its right derived functor:

$$(\,\bullet\,)^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \colon \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{R}_0) \to \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{R}). \tag{1.2}$$

For each $F \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{R}_0)$, $F^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}$ is called the formal extension of F.

From now on let us assume that $\mathscr{R}_0$ is an $\hbar$-acyclic $\mathbb{C}_X$-algebra, that is, $\mathscr{R} = \mathscr{R}_0^\hbar \simeq \mathscr{R}_0^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}$.

Proposition 1.1 ([1], Proposition 2.1)**.** *For $\mathscr{N} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{R}_0)$ one has $\mathscr{N}^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \simeq \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{R}_0}(\mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{loc}}/\hbar\mathscr{R}, \mathscr{N})$, where $\mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{loc}}/\hbar\mathscr{R}$ is regarded as an $(\mathscr{R}_0, \mathscr{R})$-bimodule.*

Proposition 1.2 ([1], Proposition 2.5)**.** *Let* $\mathscr{M} \in \mathrm{Mod}(\mathscr{R}_0)$ *and suppose that* $\mathcal{B}$ *is either a basis of open subsets of* X *or, assuming that* X *is a locally compact topological space, a basis of compact subsets, such that* $H^j(S;\mathscr{M}) = 0$ *for all* $j > 0$ *and all* $S \in \mathcal{B}$*. Then,* $\mathscr{M}$ *is* $(\bullet)^\hbar$*-acyclic, that is,* $\mathscr{M}^\hbar \simeq \mathscr{M}^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}$*.*

Lemma 1.3. *Let* $f : X \to Y$ *be a morphism of topological spaces and assume that* $(f^{-1}\mathscr{R}_0)^\hbar \simeq f^{-1}\mathscr{R}$*. Then, for each* $F \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(f^{-1}\mathscr{R}_0)$*, we have a canonical morphism in* $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{R})$*:*

$$\mathrm{R}f_!(F^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}) \to \mathrm{R}f_!(F)^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}.$$

Proof. By Proposition 1.1, and using (2.6.26) of [6], we get the following chain of morphisms in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{R})$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{R}f_!(F^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}) &\simeq \mathrm{R}f_!\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{f^{-1}\mathscr{R}_0}(f^{-1}(\mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{loc}}/\hbar\mathscr{R}), F) \\
&\to \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{R}_0}(\mathrm{R}f_*f^{-1}(\mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{loc}}/\hbar\mathscr{R}), \mathrm{R}f_!F) \\
&\to \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{R}_0}(\mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{loc}}/\hbar\mathscr{R}, \mathrm{R}f_!F) \\
&\simeq (\mathrm{R}f_!F)^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Graded modules. Consider also the right exact functor below:

$$\mathrm{Mod}(\mathscr{R}) \to \mathrm{Mod}(\mathscr{R}_0), \quad \mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M}/\hbar\mathscr{M}.$$

One denotes by $\mathrm{gr}_\hbar$ its left derived functor which assigns each $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}(\mathscr{R})$ to $\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{M}) = \mathscr{M} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{R}} \mathscr{R}_0 \in \mathsf{D}(\mathscr{R}_0)$. One calls $\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{M})$ the $\hbar$-graded object associated to $\mathscr{M}$.

Recall that $\mathrm{gr}_\hbar$ commutes with tensor products, with $\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om$ and also with direct images, proper direct images and inverse images of sheaves.

Cohomologically complete sheaves. One says that $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{R})$ has no $\hbar$-torsion if $\hbar : \mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M}$ is injective and $\mathscr{M}$ is $\hbar$-complete if the canonical morphism $\mathscr{M} \to \varprojlim_n \mathscr{M}/\hbar^{n+1}\mathscr{M}$ is an isomorphism.

Set $\mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{loc}} := \mathbb{C}_X^{\hbar,\mathrm{loc}} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar} \mathscr{R}$. The counterpart of $\hbar$-complete modules in the derived category is the notion of cohomologically complete object: $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}(\mathscr{R})$ is cohomologically complete if $\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{R}}(\mathscr{R}^{\mathrm{loc}}, \mathscr{M}) = 0$.

The notions of $\hbar$-complete object and cohomologically complete object don't depend on the base ring. Hence, if $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}(\mathscr{R})$, then $\mathscr{M}$ is cohomologically complete if and only if it is cohomologically complete as an object in $\mathsf{D}(\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar)$. We refer to [8] for a detailed exposition on cohomologically complete objects.

We need the following results.

Proposition 1.4 ([8], Corollary 1.5.9)**.** *The functor* $\mathrm{gr}_\hbar$ *is conservative on the triangulated subcategory of* $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{R})$ *consisting of cohomologically complete* *objects, that is, a morphism* $\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{N}$ *between cohomologically complete objects in* $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{R})$ *is an isomorphism if and only if* $\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{M}) \to \mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{N})$ *is an isomorphism in* $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{R}_0)$*.*

Proposition 1.5 ([8], Proposition 1.5.10)**.** *Assume that* $\mathscr{N} \in \mathsf{D}(\mathscr{R})$ *is cohomologically complete. Then,* $\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{R}}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{N})$ *is cohomologically complete for any* $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}(\mathscr{R})$*.*

Proposition 1.6 ([8], Proposition 1.5.12)**.** *Let* $f : X \to Y$ *be a morphism of topological spaces and* $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{R})$*. If* $\mathscr{M}$ *is cohomologically complete, then so is* $\mathrm{R}f_*(\mathscr{M})$*.*

Proposition 1.7 ([10], Proposition 1.14)**.** *Let* $f : X \to Y$ *be a morphism of topological spaces. Assume that* $F \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}^\hbar_Y)$ *is non-characteristic for* f *and cohomologically complete. Then,* $f^{-1}F$ *is also cohomologically complete.*

Proposition 1.8 ([1], Proposition 2.2)**.** *For any* $\mathscr{N} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{R}_0)$*,* $\mathscr{N}^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}$ *is cohomologically complete.*

Lemma 1.9 ([1], Lemma 2.3)**.** *Assume that* $\mathscr{R}_0$ *is an* $\mathscr{S}_0$*-algebra for* $\mathscr{S}_0$ *a commutative sheaf of rings, and let* $\mathscr{S} = \mathscr{S}_0^\hbar$*. For* $\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{N} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{R}_0)$ *we have an isomorphism in* $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{S})$

$$\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{R}_0}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{N})^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \simeq \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{R}_0}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{N}^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}).$$

Remark 1.10. Given a morphism of topological spaces $f : X \to Y$ and $\mathscr{R}_0$ being an $(\,\bullet\,)^\hbar$-acyclic $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$-algebra on Y, then there is a canonical morphism of sheaves of $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$-algebras $f^{-1}\mathscr{R} = f^{-1}\mathscr{R}_0^\hbar \to (f^{-1}\mathscr{R}_0)^\hbar$ induced by the morphisms

$$f^{-1}\mathscr{R}_0^\hbar \to f^{-1}(\mathscr{R}_0 \otimes \mathbb{C}^\hbar_Y/\hbar^{n+1}\mathbb{C}^\hbar_Y) \simeq f^{-1}\mathscr{R}_0 \otimes \mathbb{C}^\hbar_X/\hbar^{n+1}\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X,$$

and by the universal property of projective limits. Hence, there is a canonical functor $F \in \mathrm{Mod}((f^{-1}\mathscr{R}_0)^\hbar) \mapsto F \in \mathrm{Mod}(f^{-1}(\mathscr{R}_0^\hbar))$.

Assumption 1.11. In the next proposition we consider a morphism of complex manifolds $f : X \to Y$ and an $(\,\bullet\,)^\hbar$-acyclic ring of $\mathbb{C}$-algebras on Y denoted by $\mathscr{R}_0$. We asume that the following cohomological property holds: there exists either a basis $\mathcal{B}$ of open subsets of Y, or, if Y is a locally compact topological space, a basis $\mathcal{B}$ of compact subsets, such that $H^j(S; \mathscr{R}_0) = 0$ for all $j > 0$ and all $S \in \mathcal{B}$.

Proposition 1.12. *Suppose that* $f : X \to Y$ *is a smooth morphism of complex manifolds and* $\mathscr{R}_0$ *an* $(\,\bullet\,)^\hbar$*-acyclic ring of* $\mathbb{C}$*-algebras on* Y *that verifies Assumption 1.11. Then we have an isomorphism of sheaves of rings* $f^{-1}\mathscr{R} \xrightarrow{\sim} (f^{-1}\mathscr{R}_0)^\hbar$*.*

Proof. Consider the canonical morphism of Remark 1.10. Note that the corresponding canonical morphism $\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(f^{-1}\mathscr{R}) \to \mathrm{gr}_\hbar((f^{-1}\mathscr{R}_0)^\hbar)$ is an isomorphism, since one has $\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(f^{-1}\mathscr{R}) \simeq \mathrm{gr}_\hbar((f^{-1}\mathscr{R}_0)^\hbar) \simeq f^{-1}\mathscr{R}_0$. Hence, in view of Proposition 1.4, it suffices to show that both $f^{-1}\mathscr{R}$ and $(f^{-1}\mathscr{R}_0)^\hbar$ are cohomologically complete objects.

The ring $\mathscr{R} \simeq \mathscr{R}_0^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}$ is cohomologically complete and it is also non-characteristic for f, since f is smooth. Hence, $f^{-1}\mathscr{R}$ is cohomologically complete by Proposition 1.7.

We shall use Proposition 1.2 to prove that $(f^{-1}\mathscr{R}_0)^\hbar$ is isomorphic to $(f^{-1}\mathscr{R}_0)^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}$, thus cohomologically complete by Proposition 1.8.

The result is now checked locally, so we can assume that $X = X' \times Y$ and that $f : X \to Y$ is the canonical projection.

Let us consider the case where $\mathcal{B}$ is a basis of open subsets of Y. It is enough to show that there exists a basis $\mathcal{B}'$ of open subsets of $X' \times Y$ such that $H^j(S', f^{-1}\mathscr{R}_0) = 0$ for all $j > 0$ and all $S' \in \mathcal{B}'$.

Consider the basis $\mathcal{B}'$ formed by the open sets $V' \times V \subset X' \times Y$ such that V' is an open ball of X' (hence, contractible) and $V \in \mathcal{B}$. We are in the conditions to apply [6, Proposition 2.7.8]. Hence, for any $j > 0$ one has:

$$H^j(V' \times V, f^{-1}\mathscr{R}_0) \simeq H^j(f^{-1}_{|V'\times V}(V), f^{-1}_{|V'\times V}\mathscr{R}_0|_V) \simeq H^j(V, \mathscr{R}_0|_V) = 0.$$

The case where $\mathcal{B}$ is a basis of compact subsets of X is similar, taking closed balls on X' instead of open balls. □

2 Elliptic pairs over $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$

2.1 Review and complements on $\mathbb{R}$-constructible sheaves of $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$-modules

Let X denote a real analytic manifold of dimension r. For $F \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X)$, one denotes by $\mathrm{SS}(F)$ the micro-support of F, which is a closed involutive subset of the cotangent bundle T^*X. For any $F \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X)$, one has $\mathrm{SS}(\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(F)) \subset \mathrm{SS}(F)$. Moreover, if F is cohomologically complete, then the equality $\mathrm{SS}(\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(F)) = \mathrm{SS}(F)$ holds (cf. [1, Proposition 1.15]), thus, one also has $\mathrm{supp}(F) = \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(F))$.

The graded functor on $\mathbb{R}$-constructible sheaves. For a commutative Noetherian unital ring $\mathbb{K}$ of finite global dimension, one denotes by $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{R}-\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{K}_X)$ the bounded derived category of sheaves of $\mathbb{K}$-modules with $\mathbb{R}$-constructible cohomology. See [6] for the general theory of constructible sheaves.

Let us denote by $\omega^\hbar_X$ the dualizing sheaf in the category $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{K}_X)$ (cf [6, Def.3.3.3]). Since every real manifold is oriented, one has $\omega^\hbar_X \simeq a^!_X\mathbb{K} \simeq \mathbb{K}_X[r]$.

Consider the duality functors:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{K}_X} &: \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{K}_X) \to \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{K}_X), \quad F \mapsto \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathbb{K}_X}(F, \mathbb{K}_X) \\ \mathrm{D}_{\mathbb{K}_X} &: \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{K}_X) \to \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{K}_X), \quad F \mapsto \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathbb{K}_X}(F, \omega^\hbar_X). \end{aligned}$$

It is well-known that they induce functors $\mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{K}_X}, \mathrm{D}_{\mathbb{K}_X} : \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{R}-\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{K}_X) \to \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{R}-\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{K}_X)$ which satisfy the microlocal relation: $\mathrm{SS}(\mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{K}_X}F) = \mathrm{SS}(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbb{K}_X}F) = \mathrm{SS}(F)^a$.

If $X = \{\mathrm{pt}\}$ and $F \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{K}_{\{\mathrm{pt}\}})$, we use instead the notation

$$F^* := \mathrm{RHom}_{\mathbb{K}}(F, \mathbb{K}) \simeq \mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{K}_{\{\mathrm{pt}\}}}F.$$

In the sequel, $\mathbb{K}$ is either $\mathbb{C}$ or $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$.

Proposition 2.1 ([1], Proposition 1.16)**.** *If $F \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{R}-\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X)$, then F is cohomologically complete.*

It follows from Proposition 2.1 and the study of cohomologically complete objects that the functor $\mathrm{gr}_\hbar : \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{R}-\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X) \to \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{R}-\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{C}_X)$ is conservative and preserves the micro-support.

The formal extension functor on $\mathbb{R}$-constructible sheaves. As an application of Proposition 1.2 (cf. [1, Corollary 2.6]), one knows that $\mathbb{R}$-constructible sheaves are $(\,\bullet\,)^\hbar$-acyclic.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $F \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{R}-\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{C}_X)$. Then we have $F^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \simeq F \otimes \mathbb{C}^\hbar_X$.*

Proof. Let

$$F^\bullet : 0 \to \bigoplus_{i\in I_a} \mathbb{C}_{U_{a,i}} \to \cdots \to \bigoplus_{i\in I_b} \mathbb{C}_{U_{b,i}} \to 0,$$

be an almost free resolution of F in the sense of the Appendix of [7]. That means that $F^\bullet$ is quasi-isomorphic to F, each family $\{U_{k,i}\}_{k\in I_k}$ is locally finite and each open subset $U_{k,i}$ of X is subanalytic and relatively compact.

Denote by $F^{\bullet,\hbar}$ the complex:

$$F^{\bullet,\hbar} : 0 \to \bigoplus_{i\in I_a} \mathbb{C}^\hbar_{U_{a,i}} \to \cdots \to \bigoplus_{i\in I_b} \mathbb{C}^\hbar_{U_{b,i}} \to 0.$$

Since $\mathbb{R}$-constructible sheaves are $\hbar$-acyclic, we have the following chain of quasi-isomorphisms in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X)$:

$$F^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \simeq (F^\bullet)^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \simeq F^{\bullet,\hbar}.$$

On the other hand, we have $F \otimes \mathbb{C}^\hbar_X \simeq F^\bullet \otimes \mathbb{C}^\hbar_X$ where we set:

$$F^\bullet \otimes \mathbb{C}^\hbar_X : 0 \to \bigoplus_{i\in I_a} \mathbb{C}_{U_{a,i}} \otimes \mathbb{C}^\hbar_X \to \cdots \to \bigoplus_{i\in I_b} \mathbb{C}_{U_{b,i}} \otimes \mathbb{C}^\hbar_X \to 0.$$

Therefore, it is enough to note that for each open subanalytic subset U we have a canonical isomorphism:

$$\mathbb{C}_U \otimes \mathbb{C}^\hbar_X \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}^\hbar_U.$$

In fact, the stalks $(\mathbb{C}^\hbar_U)_x$ and $(\mathbb{C}_U \otimes \mathbb{C}^\hbar_X)_x$ are both isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$ if $x \in U$, and both vanish if $x \notin U$. □

Corollary 2.3. *If $F \in \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{R}-\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{C}_X)$, then $F^\hbar \otimes_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X} \bullet$ is an exact functor.*

The next lemma is often used in the sequel.

Lemma 2.4. *For $F \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{R}-\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{C}_X)$ and $G \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}_X)$, there are isomorphisms in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}^{\hbar}_X)$:*

$$\begin{aligned} &(i) \quad \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathbb{C}^{\hbar}_X}(F^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}, G^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}) \simeq (\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om\,(F,G))^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \\ &(ii) \quad F^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}^{\hbar}_X} G^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \simeq F \otimes G^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Applying Proposition 2.2 we get the following chain of isomorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathbb{C}^{\hbar}_X}(F^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}, G^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}) &\simeq \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathbb{C}^{\hbar}_X}(F \otimes \mathbb{C}^{\hbar}_X, G^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}) \\ &\simeq \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om\,(F, G^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}). \end{aligned}$$

Then, the isomorphism (i) follows from Lemma 1.9.

The proof of (ii) is similar. ☐

Note that, as a particular case of (i), one gets $\mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}^{\hbar}_X} F^{\hbar} \simeq (\mathrm{D}'F)^{\hbar}$ for any $F \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{R}-\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{C}^{\hbar}_X)$.

2.2 Review and complements on $\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X$-modules

From now on X denotes a complex manifold of dimension d_X. Let $\mathscr{O}_X$, Ω_X and $\mathscr{D}_X$ denote the ring of holomorphic functions on X, the sheaf of holomorphic forms of maximal degree on X, and the ring of linear differential holomorphic operators on X, respectively. Set also $\Omega_X^{\otimes -1} := \mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_X}(\Omega_X, \mathscr{O}_X)$.

As usual, $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{gd}}(\mathscr{D}_X)$ denotes the full subcategory of $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}_X)$ consisting of good $\mathscr{D}_X$-modules (in the sense of [5]) and $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{gd}}(\mathscr{D}_X)$ denotes the full subcategory of $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}_X)$ consisting of objects with good cohomology.

Recall that objects of $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{O}_X)$ and $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}_X)$ are $\hbar$-acyclic by Proposition 1.2 (cf. [1, Corollary 2.6]).

An object $\mathscr{M}$ of $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X)$ is said to be good if $\mathrm{gr}_{\hbar}(\mathscr{M}) \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{gd}}(\mathscr{D}_X)$. Denote by $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{gd}}(\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X)$ the full triangulated subcategory of $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X)$ consisting of good objects.

We shall use the duality functors below:

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\mathrm{D}}_{\hbar,X} : \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}((\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X)^{\mathrm{op}}) &\to \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}((\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X)^{\mathrm{op}}), \quad \mathscr{M} \mapsto \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X}(\mathscr{M}, \Omega_X[d_X] \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X) \\ \mathrm{D}'_{\hbar,X} : \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}((\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X)^{\mathrm{op}}) &\to \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}((\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X)), \quad \mathscr{M} \mapsto \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that both functors $\underline{\mathrm{D}}_{\hbar,X}$ and $\mathrm{D}'_{\hbar,X}$ preserve coherence.

Remark 2.5. In the sequel, most results are stated for right $\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X$-modules but we can also get similar results for left $\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X$-modules. Indeed, the category $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X)$ of left $\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X$-modules and the category $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathscr{D}^{\hbar\,\mathrm{op}}_X)$ of right $\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X$-modules are equivalent. To see this, we use [5, Proposition 1.10] to identify the ring $\mathscr{D}^{\hbar\,\mathrm{op}}_X$ with the ring $\Omega_X \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \Omega_X^{\otimes -1}$ and, on the other hand, [5, Proposition 1.9] gives the following equivalence of categories:

$$\mathrm{Mod}(\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X) \to \mathrm{Mod}(\Omega_X \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \Omega_X^{\otimes -1}), \quad \mathscr{M} \mapsto \Omega_X \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{M}.$$

Hence, we don't distinguish left and right $\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}$-modules.

Remark 2.6. The rings $\mathscr{D}_X$ and $\mathscr{D}_X^{\mathrm{op}}$ satisfy hypothesis (1.2.2) and (1.3.1) of [8]. In particular, recall that the objects of $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar})$ are cohomologically complete cf. [8, Theorem 1.6.1].

Proposition 2.7 ([1], Proposition 2.8)**.** *For $\mathscr{N} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}_X)$:*

(a) *there is an isomorphism $\mathscr{N}^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X} \mathscr{N}$;*

(b) *there is an isomorphism $\mathrm{gr}_{\hbar}(\mathscr{N}^{\hbar}) \simeq \mathscr{N}$.*

One has the analogous of Lemma 2.4:

Lemma 2.8. *Let $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}_X)$ and $\mathscr{N} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{D}_X)$ (resp. $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar\,\mathrm{op}})$). We have the following isomorphism in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}_X^{\hbar})$:*

$$\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}}(\mathscr{M}^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}, \mathscr{N}^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}) \simeq (\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}_X}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{N}))^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}$$

(resp. $\mathscr{M}^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}} \mathscr{N}^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \simeq \mathscr{M} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X} \mathscr{N}^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}$.)

Lemma 2.9. *Let $\mathscr{N} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar})$ be a cohomologically complete object and let $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar\,\mathrm{op}})$. Then $\mathscr{M} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}} \mathscr{N}$ is cohomologically complete.*

Proof. Since $\mathscr{M}$ is coherent, the following isomorphisms hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{M} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}} \mathscr{N} &\simeq \mathsf{D}'_{\hbar,X} \mathsf{D}'_{\hbar,X} \mathscr{M} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}} \mathscr{N} \\ &\simeq \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}}(\mathrm{D}'_{\hbar,X}\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}) \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}} \mathscr{N} \\ &\simeq \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}}(\mathrm{D}'_{\hbar,X}\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{N}). \end{aligned}$$

The result follows from Propositions 1.5. ☐

Coherence and flatness criteria for $\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}$-modules. The following theorems constitute particular cases of [8, Theorem 1.6.4.] and [8, Theorem 1.6.6].

Theorem 2.10. *Let $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{+}(\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar})$ and assume the following conditions:*

(a) *$\mathscr{M}$ is cohomologically complete,*

(b) $\mathrm{gr}_{\hbar}(\mathscr{M}) \in \mathsf{D}^{+}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}_X)$.

Then, $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{+}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar})$ and for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ one has the isomorphism

$$H^i(\mathscr{M}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \varprojlim_n H^i(\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}/\hbar^{n+1}\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}} \mathscr{M}).$$

Theorem 2.11. *Let $\mathscr{M}$ be a $\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}$-module and assume the following conditions:*

(a) *$\mathscr{M}$ has no $\hbar$-torsion,*

(b) *$\mathscr{M}$ is cohomologically complete,*

(c) *$\mathscr{M}/\hbar\mathscr{M}$ is a flat $\mathscr{D}_X$-module.*

Then $\mathscr{M}$ is a flat $\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar$-module.

Direct images of $\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar$-modules. Let us briefly recall the functor of direct image for $\mathscr{D}^\hbar$-modules introduced in [10].

Let $f : X \to Y$ be a morphism of complex manifolds and consider the usual transfer-module $\mathscr{D}_{X\to Y} := \mathscr{O}_X \otimes_{f^{-1}\mathscr{O}_Y} f^{-1}\mathscr{D}_Y$ with its structure of $(\mathscr{D}_X, f^{-1}\mathscr{D}_Y)$-bimodule. Denote by $\underline{f}_*$ and $\underline{f}_!$ the functors of direct image and proper direct image in the $\mathscr{D}$-modules framework.

Set

$$\mathscr{D}_{X\to Y,\hbar} := \varprojlim_n (\mathscr{O}_X \otimes_{f^{-1}\mathscr{O}_Y} f^{-1}(\mathscr{D}_Y^\hbar/\hbar^{n+1}\mathscr{D}_Y^\hbar)).$$

(This object was denoted by $\mathcal{K}$ in [10].)

Since each component of the projective limit has a canonical structure of $(\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar, f^{-1}\mathscr{D}_Y^\hbar)$-bimodule with $\hbar$-torsion, then $\mathscr{D}_{X\to Y,\hbar}$ is also a $(\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar, f^{-1}\mathscr{D}_Y^\hbar)$-bimodule.

Notation 2.12. When there is no risk of confusion we shall use the following abbreviations: $\mathscr{K}_\hbar := \mathscr{D}_{X\to Y,\hbar}$ and $\mathscr{K} := \mathscr{D}_{X\to Y}$.

One can also regard $\mathscr{K}^\hbar$ as a $(\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar, f^{-1}\mathscr{D}_Y^\hbar)$-bimodule (cf. Remark 1.10) and one has an isomorphism of bimodules:

$$\mathscr{K}_\hbar \simeq \mathscr{K}^\hbar.$$

Moreover, as proved in [10, Proposition 4.5], $\mathscr{K}_\hbar \simeq \mathscr{K}^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}$ is a cohomologically complete object and it is free of $\hbar$-torsion, with $\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{K}_\hbar) \simeq \mathscr{K}$.

Lemma 2.13. (a) *The transfer module $\mathscr{K}_\hbar$ is flat over $\mathscr{O}_X^\hbar$.*

(b) *If f is a smooth morphism, then $\mathscr{K}_\hbar$ is a coherent left $\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar$-module.*

Proof. Recall that $\mathscr{K}$ is flat over $\mathscr{O}_X$, since $f^{-1}\mathscr{D}_Y$ is a free $f^{-1}\mathscr{O}_Y$-module. Therefore (a) is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.11.

It is well known that $\mathscr{K}$ is a coherent left $\mathscr{D}_X$-module in the smooth case, thus (b) follows by Theorem 2.10. □

The direct image functor in the framework of $\mathscr{D}^\hbar$-modules is the functor denoted by $\underline{f}_{*,\hbar}$ and given by:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \underline{f}_{*,\hbar} : \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar) & \to & \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{D}_Y^\hbar) \\ \mathscr{M} & \mapsto & \mathrm{R}f_*(\mathscr{M} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar} \mathscr{K}_\hbar). \end{array}$$

Similarly, the proper direct image functor is denoted by $\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}$ and given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{f}_{!,\hbar} : \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}) &\to \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{D}_Y^{\hbar}) \\ \mathscr{M} &\mapsto \mathrm{R}f_!(\mathscr{M} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}} \mathscr{K}_{\hbar}). \end{aligned}$$

The next result is an easy consequence of the properties of $\mathrm{gr}_{\hbar}$.

Lemma 2.14. *For any* $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar})$*, the isomorphisms* $\mathrm{gr}_{\hbar}(\underline{f}_{*,\hbar}(\mathscr{M})) \simeq \underline{f}_*(\mathrm{gr}_{\hbar}(\mathscr{M}))$ *and* $\mathrm{gr}_{\hbar}(\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(\mathscr{M})) \simeq \underline{f}_!(\mathrm{gr}_{\hbar}(\mathscr{M}))$ *hold in* $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{D}_Y)$*.*

Lemma 2.15 ([10], Lemma 4.17)**.** *For any* $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar})$*, the direct image* $\underline{f}_{*,\hbar}(\mathscr{M})$ *is cohomologically complete.*

Theorem 2.16 ([10], Theorem 4.18)**.** *Assume that* $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{gd}}(\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar})$ *and that* f *is proper when restricted to the support of* $\mathscr{M}$*. Then,* $\underline{f}_{*,\hbar}(\mathscr{M}) \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{gd}}(\mathscr{D}_Y^{\hbar})$*.*

The f-characteristic variety of a coherent $\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}$-module. For the reader's convenience let us recall the definition of the f-characteristic variety of coherent $\mathscr{D}_X$-modules, following [14].

Let S be an analytic manifold. A relative analytic manifold over S is an analytic manifold X endowed with a surjective analytic submersion $\varepsilon : X \to S$. In this situation, the relative cotangent bundle $T^*X|S$ is defined as the cokernel of the injective dual map ${}^t\varepsilon' : X \times_Y T^*Y \to T^*X$. Therefore, there is a canonical projection $\rho : T^*X \to T^*X|S$.

The ring of relative differential operators, denoted by $\mathscr{D}_{X|S}$, is the subring of $\mathscr{H}om_{\mathbb{C}_X}(\mathscr{O}_X, \mathscr{O}_X)$ generated by the derivatives along vertical holomorphic vectors fields and multiplication with holomorphic functions. Since the ring $\mathscr{D}_{X|S}$ is filtered by the order, one uses the usual techniques to define the characteristic variety of $\mathscr{M} \in \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}_{X|S})$. One denotes it by $\mathrm{char}_{X|S}(\mathscr{M})$. Recall that $\mathrm{char}_{X|S}(\mathscr{M})$ is a conic analytic subset of $T^*X|S$. We refer to [13] for further details on relative $\mathscr{D}$-modules.

Consider now the case of an analytic submersion $f : X \to Y$ and the associated exact sequence of vector bundles on X:

$$0 \to X \times_Y T^*Y \underset{\psi_f}{\to} T^*X \underset{\varphi_f}{\to} T^*X|Y \to 0.$$

The f-characteristic variety $\mathrm{char}_f(\mathscr{M})$ of $\mathscr{M}$ with respect to f is the subset of T^*X which coincides on T^*U with $\varphi_f^{-1}\,\mathrm{char}_{U|Y}(\mathscr{L})$ for any open subset U and any coherent $\mathscr{D}_{U|Y}$-submodule $\mathscr{L}$ of $\mathscr{M}|_U$ which generates $\mathscr{M}|_U$ as a $\mathscr{D}_U$-module.

More generally, consider a morphism $f : X \to Y$, not necessarily smooth, and the associated graph factorization $X \xrightarrow{i} X \times Y \xrightarrow{p} Y$. One defines the f-characteristic variety of $\mathscr{M} \in \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}_X)$ as $\mathrm{char}_f(\mathscr{M}) = {}^t i' i_{\pi}^{-1}\,\mathrm{char}_q(\underline{i}_!(\mathscr{M}))$.

These two definitions are compatible, that is, they coincide in the case of smooth morphisms. Moreover, the definition extend as usual to the derived category: for an object $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}_X)$ one sets $\mathrm{char}_f(\mathscr{M}) = \bigcup_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathrm{char}_f(\mathscr{H}^j(\mathscr{M}))$.

Recall also that $\mathrm{char}_f(\mathscr{M})$ is a closed conic analytic subvariety of T^*X which satisfies the following essential formula:

$$\mathrm{SS}(\mathscr{M} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X} \mathscr{K}) \subset \mathrm{char}_f(\mathscr{M}). \tag{2.1}$$

The object char_{a_X} is the usual characteristic variety of $\mathscr{M}$, denoted simply by $\mathrm{char}(\mathscr{M})$, and in such case the inclusion (2.1) gives the well-known estimative: $\mathrm{SS}(\mathrm{Sol}(\mathscr{M})) \subset \mathrm{char}(\mathscr{M})$. Note that Sol denotes the solutions functor in the $\mathscr{D}$-module framework, whose counterpart in the $\mathscr{D}^\hbar$-modules framework is the functor $\mathrm{Sol}_\hbar$ studied in [1]:

$$\mathrm{Sol}_\hbar : \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X)^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X), \quad \mathscr{M} \mapsto \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{O}^\hbar_X).$$

Definition 2.17. The f-characteristic variety of $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X)$ is a subset of the cotangent bundle T^*X denoted by $\mathrm{char}_{f,\hbar}(\mathscr{M})$ and given by $\mathrm{char}_{f,\hbar}(\mathscr{M}) := \mathrm{char}_f(\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{M}))$.

For any $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X)$, $\mathrm{char}_{a_X,\hbar}(\mathscr{M})$ coincides with the characteristic variety of $\mathscr{M}$ denoted by $\mathrm{char}_\hbar(\mathscr{M})$.

Recall that $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X)$ is said to be holonomic if $\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{M})$ is holonomic in the $\mathscr{D}$-modules sense, that is, if $\mathrm{char}_\hbar(\mathscr{M}) = \mathrm{char}(\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{M}))$ is a lagrangian subvariety of T^*X.

Lemma 2.18. *For any* $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X)$, *we have* $\mathrm{SS}(\mathscr{M} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X} \mathscr{K}_\hbar) \subset \mathrm{char}_{f,\hbar}(\mathscr{M})$.

Proof. The object $\mathscr{M} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X} \mathscr{K}_\hbar$ is cohomologically complete by Lemma 2.9. Hence, $\mathrm{SS}(\mathscr{M} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X} \mathscr{K}_\hbar) = \mathrm{SS}(\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{M}) \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X} \mathscr{K})$. Therefore, the result is reduced to the estimative (2.1) applied to $\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{M}) \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}_X)$. ☐

We remark that $\mathrm{SS}(\mathrm{Sol}_\hbar(\mathscr{M})) = \mathrm{char}_\hbar(\mathscr{M})$ is already proved in [1].

Example 2.19. Let $P = \sum_{n\geq 0} P_n \hbar^n \in \mathscr{D}^\hbar_X$, with $P_n \in \mathscr{D}_X$, for each $n \geq 0$. Set $\mathscr{M} := \mathscr{D}^\hbar_X / \mathscr{D}^\hbar_X P$. By [1, Lemma 3.5] one has $\mathrm{char}_\hbar(\mathscr{M}) = \mathrm{char}(\mathscr{M}/\hbar\mathscr{M})$. Hence, the characteristic variety of $\mathscr{M}$ coincides with the characteristic variety of the coherent $\mathscr{D}_X$-module $\mathscr{D}_X / \mathscr{D}_X P_0$.

2.3 f-elliptic pairs over $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$: definition and motivation

Definition 2.20. An f-elliptic pair over $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$ is a pair $(\mathscr{M}, F)$ with $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}^{\hbar\,\mathrm{op}}_X)$, $F \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{R}-\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X)$ such that $\mathrm{char}_{f,\hbar}(\mathscr{M}) \cap \mathrm{SS}(F) \subset T^*_X X$. If moreover $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{gd}}(\mathscr{D}^{\hbar\,\mathrm{op}}_X)$, then we say that $(\mathscr{M}, F)$ is a good f-elliptic pair over $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$. We define the support of the f-elliptic pair $(\mathscr{M}, F)$ as the intersection $\mathrm{supp}(\mathscr{M}) \cap \mathrm{supp}(F)$.

Proposition 2.21. *Let* $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar\,\mathrm{op}})$ *and* $F \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{R}-\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X)$*. Then* $(\mathscr{M}, F)$ *is an* f*-elliptic pair over* $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$ *if and only if* $(\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{M}), \mathrm{gr}_\hbar(F))$ *is an* f*-elliptic pair over* $\mathbb{C}$ *(in the sense of [14]).*

Proof. The functor $\mathrm{gr}_\hbar$ preserves the micro-support of $\mathbb{R}$-constructible sheaves and also the characteristic variety of coherent $\mathscr{D}^\hbar$-modules by definition. $\square$

If $(\mathscr{M}, F)$ is an f-elliptic pair over $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$, then $(\underline{\mathrm{D}}_X\mathscr{M}, \mathrm{D}'F)$ is also an f-elliptic pair over $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$, which we call the dual elliptic pair of $(\mathscr{M}, F)$.

Let us consider the case where X is the complexification of a real analytic manifold M.

Definition 2.22. We say that a coherent $\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X$-module $\mathscr{M}$ is an elliptic $\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X$-module if $(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{C}^\hbar_M)$ is an elliptic pair over $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$ and we say that an operator $P \in \mathscr{D}^\hbar_X$ is an elliptic operator if $\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X/\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X P$ is an elliptic $\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X$-module.

In other words, $\mathscr{M} \in \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X)$ is elliptic if $\mathrm{char}_\hbar(\mathscr{M}) \cap T^*_M X \subset T^*_X X$ and, by Example 2.19, we deduce that $P \in \mathscr{D}^\hbar_X$ is elliptic if and only if its $\hbar$-independent component P_0 is an elliptic operator in the classical sense. Denoting by $\sigma(P_0)$ the principal symbol of P_0 and taking on T^*X a system of holomorphic coordinates $(x;\eta)$, P_0 being elliptic means that $\sigma(P_0)((x; i\eta)) \neq 0$ for $\eta \neq 0$.

Take, for example, $X = \mathbb{C}^n$, $M = \mathbb{R}^n$ and denote by Δ the Laplace operator. Then, $P = \Delta + \hbar P'$ is elliptic for any $P' \in \mathscr{D}^\hbar_X$.

The meaning of elliptic pairs on the real analytic setting illustrates why one can regard the theory of elliptic pairs (over $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$) as a natural generalization of the theory of elliptic systems on real analytic manifolds. We shall return to this particular setting in the last section of the paper.

3 Theorems on elliptic pairs over $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$

In this section $f : X \to Y$ denotes a morphism of complex analytic manifolds of dimensions d_X and d_Y, respectively.

3.1 Regularity theorems

General regularity theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Let* $(\mathscr{M}, F)$ *be an elliptic pair over* $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$*. Then, the natural morphism below is an isomorphism in* $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X)$*:*

$$F \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X} (\mathscr{M} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X} \mathscr{K}_\hbar) \to \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X}(\mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X} F, \mathscr{M} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X} \mathscr{K}_\hbar) \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. The morphism (3.1) is induced by the isomorphism $F \simeq \mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X}\mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X} F$ and by the canonical morphism:

$$\mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X}\mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X} F \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X} (\mathscr{M} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X} \mathscr{K}_\hbar) \to \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X}(\mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X} F, \mathscr{M} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X} \mathscr{K}_\hbar).$$

Recall that we have $\mathrm{SS}(\mathscr{M}\overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar}\mathscr{K}_\hbar) \subset \mathrm{char}_{f,\hbar}(\mathscr{M})$ by Lemma 2.18. On the other hand, $\mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar}F$ has $\mathbb{R}$-constructible cohomology groups and $\mathrm{SS}(\mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar}F) = \mathrm{SS}(F)^a$, where a denotes the opposite map on T^*X. Hence, the transversality condition on the f-elliptic pair $(\mathscr{M},F)$ implies that

$$\mathrm{SS}(\mathscr{M}\overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar}\mathscr{K}_\hbar) \cap \mathrm{SS}(\mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar}F)^a \subset T^*_XX.$$

The conclusion follows by [6, Proposition 5.4.14]. □

Remark 3.2. We can rewrite the isomorphism (3.1) in terms of left $\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar$-modules, i.e., assuming that $(\mathscr{M},F)$ is an f-elliptic pair, with $\mathscr{M}$ being a left $\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar$-module; we have in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar)$:

$$\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar}(\mathscr{M}, \mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar}F\overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar}\mathscr{K}_\hbar) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar}(\mathscr{M}, \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar}(F,\mathscr{K}_\hbar)).$$

Regularity theorems in the formal extension case. We want to refine the regularity property in the cases where F (resp. $\mathscr{M}$) are formal extensions of objects in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{R}-\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{C}_X)$ (resp. $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}_X)$). Let us start with some auxiliar results.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $F, G \in \mathrm{Mod}(\mathbb{C}_X)$. There is a natural morphism in $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar)$:*

$$F\otimes G^\hbar \to (F\otimes G)^\hbar. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. The morphism is defined by the projective system of morphisms

$$\begin{aligned} F\otimes G^\hbar &\to F\otimes(G\otimes(\mathbb{C}^\hbar/\hbar^{n+1}\mathbb{C}^\hbar)) \\ &\xrightarrow{\sim} (F\otimes G)\otimes(\mathbb{C}^\hbar/\hbar^{n+1}\mathbb{C}^\hbar). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3.4. *Let $F, G \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}_X)$. Then there is a natural bifunctorial morphism in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar)$:*

$$F\otimes G^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \to (F\otimes G)^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. (i) First, fix $F \in \mathrm{Mod}(\mathbb{C}_X)$ and consider the two functors from $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbb{C}_X)$ to $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar)$: $\theta_1\colon G\mapsto F\otimes G^\hbar$ and $\theta_2\colon G\mapsto (F\otimes G)^\hbar$. By Lemma 3.3, there is a morphism of functors $u\colon \theta_1\to\theta_2$. Since both functors are left exact, this morphism u extends to the derived functors and we get the morphism (3.3) for a fixed $F\in\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbb{R}-\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{C}_X)$.
(ii) Now let us fix $G \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}_X)$ and consider the two functors from $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbb{C}_X)$ to $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar)$: $\lambda_1\colon F\mapsto F\otimes G^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}$ and $\lambda_2\colon F\mapsto (F\otimes G)^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}$. By (i) there exists a morphism of functors $v\colon\lambda_1\to\lambda_2$. Both functors extend naturally to the category of bounded complexes $\mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathrm{Mod}(\mathbb{C}_X))$ and send complexes quasi-isomorphic to zero to objects isomorphic to zero in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar)$. Hence, both functors extend to $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}_X)$ as well as the morphism of functors v. □

Lemma 3.5. *For $F, G \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}_X)$, we have a commutative diagram in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar)$:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{D}'F \otimes G^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \arrow[r] \arrow[dr] & (\mathrm{D}'F \otimes G)^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \arrow[d] \\
 & \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om\,(F, G)^{\mathrm{R}\hbar},
\end{tikzcd} \tag{3.4}$$

such that the morphism in the horizontal arrow is the one given by Lemma 3.4.

Proof. The oblique arrow is the composition of two canonical morphisms:

$$\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om\,(F, \mathbb{C}) \otimes G^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \to \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om\,(F, G^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om\,(F, G)^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}.$$

The vertical arrow is defined by applying the functor $(\bullet)^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}$ to the canonical morphism $\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om\,(F, \mathbb{C}) \otimes G \to \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om\,(F, G)$. The commutativity of the diagram is obvious. □

Remark 3.6. Assuming that $G \in \mathrm{Mod}(\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar)$ in Lemma 3.3, then the morphism (3.2) is $\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar$-linear. Similarly, if $G \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar)$, then the morphism (3.3) is a morphism in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar)$ and the diagram in Lemma 3.5 is a commutative diagram in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar)$. In particular, we shall use in the sequel the following canonical morphism in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar)$, for $F \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}_X)$:

$$F \otimes \mathscr{K}_\hbar \to (F \otimes \mathscr{K})^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}. \tag{3.5}$$

Theorem 3.7. *Let $F \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{R}-\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{C}_X)$ and suppose that $(\mathscr{M}, F^\hbar)$ is an f-elliptic pair over $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$. Then there is a commutative diagram of isomorphisms in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar)$:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar}(\mathscr{M}, \mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar} F^\hbar \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar} \mathscr{K}_\hbar) \arrow[r, "\sim"] \arrow[dr, "\sim"] & \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar}(\mathscr{M}, (\mathrm{D}'F \otimes \mathscr{K})^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}) \arrow[d, "\sim"] \\
 & \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar}(\mathscr{M}, \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om\,(F, \mathscr{K})^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}).
\end{tikzcd} \tag{3.6}$$

Proof. First note that we obtain the diagram (3.6) by applying the functor $\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar}(\mathscr{M}, \bullet)$ to the commutative diagram provided by Lemma 3.5:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{D}'F \otimes \mathscr{K}_\hbar \arrow[r] \arrow[dr] & (\mathrm{D}'F \otimes \mathscr{K})^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \arrow[d] \\
 & \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om\,(F, \mathscr{K})^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}.
\end{tikzcd}$$

We also use the fact that $\mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar} F^\hbar \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar} \mathscr{K}_\hbar$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{D}'F \otimes \mathscr{K}_\hbar$.

Note that the oblique arrow is an isomorphism since it is the composition of two canonical isomorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X}(\mathscr{M}, \mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X} F^\hbar \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X} \mathscr{K}_\hbar) &\xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X}(\mathscr{M}, \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X}(F^\hbar, \mathscr{K}_\hbar)) \\ &\xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X}(\mathscr{M}, \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om(F, \mathscr{K}_\hbar)^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}),\end{aligned}$$

The first one results from applying the regularity theorem 3.1 to the f-elliptic pair $(\mathscr{M}, F^\hbar)$ (see also Remark 3.2) and the second isomorphism results from Lemma 2.4.

The vertical arrow is also an isomorphism in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X)$. Indeed, the objects on both sides of the vertical arrow are cohomologically complete by Propositions 1.5 and 1.8. Hence, since $\mathrm{gr}_\hbar$ is conservative on cohomologically complete objects, it is enough to prove that the canonical morphism below is an isomorphism:

$$\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}_X}(\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{M}), \mathrm{D}'F \otimes \mathscr{K}) \to \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}_X}(\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{M}), \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om(F, \mathscr{K})). \quad (3.7)$$

In fact, $(\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{M}), F)$ is an f-elliptic pair over $\mathbb{C}$ and the morphism (2.18) is precisely the regularity isomorphism for elliptic pairs over $\mathbb{C}$ applied to $(\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{M}), F)$ (cf. [14, Theorem 2.15]).

We have proved that the oblique and vertical arrows in diagram (3.6) are isomorphisms. The commutativity of the diagram allow us to conclude that the horizontal arrow is also an isomorphism. □

Theorem 3.7, together with Lemmas 1.9 and 2.8, gives the next corollary.

Corollary 3.8. *Let $(\mathscr{M}, F)$ be an f-elliptic pair over $\mathbb{C}$. Then, $(\mathscr{M}^\hbar, F^\hbar)$ is an f-elliptic pair over $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$ and there are canonical isomorphisms in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X)$:*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X}(\mathscr{M}^\hbar, \mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X} F^\hbar \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X} \mathscr{K}_\hbar) &\simeq \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}_X}(\mathscr{M}, \mathrm{D}'F \otimes \mathscr{K})^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \\ &\simeq \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}_X}(\mathscr{M}, \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathbb{C}_X}(F, \mathscr{K}))^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}.\end{aligned}$$

3.2 Finiteness theorem

Theorem 3.9. *Let $(\mathscr{M}, F)$ be a good f-elliptic pair over $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$ and suppose that f is proper when restricted to the support of $(\mathscr{M}, F)$. Then, $\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(\mathscr{M} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X} F)$ is an object of $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{gd}}(\mathscr{D}^\hbar_Y)$.*

Proof. One can replace in Theorem 2.10 the coherency property with the goodness property, thus, in view of that theorem it suffices to prove that:

(i) $\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(F \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X} \mathscr{M})$ is cohomologically complete;

(ii) $\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(F \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X} \mathscr{M}))$ belongs to $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{gd}}(\mathscr{D}^\hbar_Y)$.

Set $\mathscr{L}:=(F\overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X}\mathscr{M})\overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X}\mathscr{K}_\hbar$. The regularity theorem 3.1 yields the isomorphism:

$$\mathscr{L}\simeq \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X}(\mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X}F,\mathscr{M}\overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X}\mathscr{K}_\hbar).$$

Therefore, $\mathscr{L}$ is cohomologically complete in view of Proposition 1.5 and Lemma 2.9. Moreover, $\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(F\overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X}\mathscr{M})=\mathrm{R}f_!(\mathscr{L})$ is also cohomologically complete by Proposition 1.6, since $\mathrm{R}f_*$ and $\mathrm{R}f_!$ coincide under the properness hypothesis.

On the other hand, note that $(\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{M}),\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(F))$ is an f-elliptic pair over $\mathbb{C}$ that satisfies the conditions of the finiteness theorem for elliptic pairs over $\mathbb{C}$. Hence, $\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(F\overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X}\mathscr{M}))\simeq\underline{f}_!(\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(F)\otimes\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{M}))$ is an object of $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{gd}}(\mathscr{D}_Y)$ by [14, Theorem 4.2]. $\square$

3.3 Duality theorem

Assumption 3.10. The remaining results of this section are obtained assuming that $f:X\to Y$ is a smooth morphism of complex manifolds.

Proposition 3.11. *If $f:X\to Y$ is smooth, then $f^{-1}\mathscr{D}^\hbar_Y\simeq(f^{-1}\mathscr{D}_Y)^\hbar$.*

Proof. This is a particular case of Proposition 1.12 choosing for $\mathcal{B}$ the family of compact Stein subsets of Y. $\square$

In the non-smooth case, the rings $f^{-1}\mathscr{D}^\hbar_Y$ and $(f^{-1}\mathscr{D}_Y)^\hbar$ are not necessarily isomorphic.

Example 3.12. Let X be the complexification of a real analytic manifold M and consider the natural embedding $i:M\hookrightarrow X$. Given an open subset V of M, a section $Q\in\Gamma(V;i^{-1}\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X)$ can be regarded as a formal series $Q=\sum Q_n|_V\hbar^n$, with $Q_n\in\Gamma(U;\mathscr{D}_X)$, for some open subset U of X such that $U\cap M=V$. On the other hand, a section $R\in\Gamma(V;(i^{-1}\mathscr{D}_X)^\hbar)$ can be regarded as a formal series $R=\sum R_n|_V\hbar^n$, with $R_n\in\Gamma(U_n;\mathscr{D}_X)$, for some family $(U_n)_{n\geq 0}$ of open subsets of X such that $U_n\cap M=V$, for each $n\geq 0$. Hence, the canonical morphism $i^{-1}\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X\simeq(i^{-1}\mathscr{D}_X)^\hbar$ is a monomorphism which is not epimorphism.

The trace morphism in the $\hbar$-setting. If $\mathscr{M}$ is a right $(\mathscr{D}_X,\mathscr{D}_X)$-bimodule, its direct image as a bimodule is the object in the derived category $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{D}_Y^{\mathrm{op}}\otimes\mathscr{D}_Y^{\mathrm{op}})$ defined by:

$$\underline{\underline{f}}_!(\mathscr{M}):=\mathrm{R}f_!((\mathscr{M}\overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X}\mathscr{K})\overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X}\mathscr{K}).$$

In particular $\Omega_X\overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{O}_X}\mathscr{D}_X$ is a right $(\mathscr{D}_X,\mathscr{D}_X)$-bimodule and one has the so-called differential trace morphism in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{D}_Y^{\mathrm{op}}\otimes\mathscr{D}_Y^{\mathrm{op}})$:

$$\mathrm{tr}_f:\underline{\underline{f}}_!(\Omega_X[d_X]\otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X}\mathscr{D}_X)\to\Omega_Y[d_Y]\otimes_{\mathscr{O}_Y}\mathscr{D}_Y. \tag{3.8}$$

Similarly, we define the direct image of a right $(\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X, \mathscr{D}^\hbar_X)$-bimodule as the object in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}({\mathscr{D}^\hbar_Y}^{\mathrm{op}} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}^\hbar} {\mathscr{D}^\hbar_Y}^{\mathrm{op}})$ given by:

$$\underline{\underline{f}}_{!,\hbar}(\mathscr{M}) := \mathrm{R}f_!((\mathscr{M} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X} \mathscr{K}_\hbar) \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X} \mathscr{K}_\hbar).$$

Our purpose in this subsection is to construct a version of the trace morphism in the $\hbar$-framework.

Suppose that $\mathscr{M}$ is an $\mathscr{O}_X$-module and denote by Θ_X the sheaf of holomorphic vector fields on X. In order to define a structure of $\mathscr{D}_X$-module on $\mathscr{M}$ it is enough to define an action of Θ_X on $\mathscr{M}$ that is compatible with the action of $\mathscr{O}_X$. See, for example, [5, Lemma 1.7] for details. Although we don't have the analogous of such result in the $\hbar$-setting, we have the following adaptation:

Lemma 3.13. *Let $\mathscr{M} \in \mathrm{Mod}(\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X)$ be an $\hbar$-complete object and assume that there is a well-defined structure of $\mathscr{D}_X$-module on $\mathscr{M}$. Then, there is a well-defined structure of $\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X$-module on $\mathscr{M}$.*

Proof. Let U be an open subset of X, $\sum P_n \hbar^n \in \Gamma(U; \mathscr{D}^\hbar_X)$ and $u \in \Gamma(U; \mathscr{M})$. For each n, $u_n := P_n \cdot u$ is a well-defined section in $\Gamma(U; \mathscr{M})$. On the other hand, by the $\hbar$-completeness of $\mathscr{M}$, $\sum_n u_n \hbar^n$ is also a well-defined section of $\Gamma(U; \mathscr{M})$. Hence, the action of $\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X$ is naturally defined by $(\sum P_n \hbar^n) \cdot u = \sum_n u_n \hbar^n$. □

Lemma 3.14. *The object $\mathscr{D}^\hbar \otimes_{\mathscr{D}_X} \mathscr{K}$ has a natural structure of $(\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X, f^{-1}{\mathscr{D}^\hbar_Y}^{\mathrm{op}})$-bimodule and it is isomorphic to $\mathscr{K}_\hbar$ as a bimodule.*

Proof. Since $\mathscr{K}_\hbar$ is coherent over $\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X$ one has an isomorphism in $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X)$:

$$\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X \otimes_{\mathscr{D}_X} \mathscr{K} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathscr{K}_\hbar. \tag{3.9}$$

Moreover, the object $\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X \otimes_{\mathscr{D}_X} \mathscr{K}$ in the left hand side has a natural structure of right $f^{-1}{\mathscr{D}^\hbar_Y}^{\mathrm{op}}$-module by Lemma 3.13. Indeed, it is a right $f^{-1}\mathscr{D}_Y$-module and it is an $\hbar$-complete $\mathbb{C}^\hbar_X$-algebra. Moreover, the action of $f^{-1}\mathscr{D}^\hbar_Y$ is naturally compatible with the action of $\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X$ and with the isomorphism (3.9), thus (3.9) is an isomorphism of $(\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X, f^{-1}{\mathscr{D}^\hbar_Y}^{\mathrm{op}})$-bimodules. □

Lemma 3.15. *There is a canonical morphism:*

$$\mathscr{K}_\hbar \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{K} \xrightarrow{q} (\mathscr{K} \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{K})^\hbar,$$

that preserves the structure of left $\mathscr{D}^\hbar_X$-module and the structure of right $f^{-1}\mathscr{D}^\hbar_Y$-bimodule of the objects on both sides of the morphism.

Proof. Considering the natural morphisms $\mathscr{K}_\hbar \to \mathscr{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}_X} \mathbb{C}^\hbar_X / \hbar^n \mathbb{C}^\hbar_X$, we obtain canonical morphisms:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathscr{K}^\hbar \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{K} & \xrightarrow{q_n} & (\mathscr{K} \otimes \mathbb{C}^\hbar_X / \hbar^n \mathbb{C}^\hbar_X) \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{K} \\ & \simeq & (\mathscr{K} \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{K}) \otimes \mathbb{C}^\hbar_X / \hbar^n \mathbb{C}^\hbar_X \end{array}$$

We get the morphism q by the universal property of projective limits. It is obvious that such morphism preserves the algebraic structures involved, since each q_n preserves such structures. □

Proposition 3.16. *The morphism f induces a differential trace morphism in the derived category* $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}({\mathscr{D}_Y^{\hbar}}^{\mathrm{op}} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}^{\hbar}} {\mathscr{D}_Y^{\hbar}}^{\mathrm{op}})$*:*

$$\mathrm{tr}_{f,\hbar} : \underline{\underline{f}}_{!,\hbar}(\Omega_X[d_X] \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}) \to \Omega_Y[d_Y] \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_Y} \mathscr{D}_Y^{\hbar}.$$

Proof. We have the following chain of isomorphisms preserving the algebraic structures involved:

$$\begin{array}{rl} & ((\Omega_X[d_X] \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}) \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}} \mathscr{K}_{\hbar}) \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}} \mathscr{K}_{\hbar} \\ \simeq & (\Omega_X[d_X] \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{K}_{\hbar}) \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}} \mathscr{K}_{\hbar} \\ \simeq & (\Omega_X[d_X] \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{K}_{\hbar}) \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X} \mathscr{K} \\ \simeq & \Omega_X[d_X] \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X} (\mathscr{K}_{\hbar} \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{K}). \end{array}$$

The first isomorphism results from the associativity of the tensor products, having in mind the canonical structure of right $\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}$-module of $\Omega_X[d_X] \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{K}_{\hbar}$, cf. Remark 2.5. The second isomorphism follows from Lemma 3.14. The third isomorphism follows from the isomorphism in [14, Lemma 2.1].

By Lemma 3.15 there is a morphism $\mathscr{K}_{\hbar} \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{K} \to (\mathscr{K} \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{K})^{\hbar}$. Moreover, there is also a canonical morphism $(\mathscr{K} \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{K})^{\hbar} \simeq \tau^{\leq 0}((\mathscr{K} \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{K})^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}) \to (\mathscr{K} \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{K})^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}$, $\tau^{\leq 0}$ being the usual truncated functor for objects in the derived category. Hence, we obtain a morphism:

$$\Omega_X[d_X] \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X} (\mathscr{K}_{\hbar} \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{K}) \to \Omega_X[d_X] \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X} (\mathscr{K} \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{K})^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}.$$

Finally, we have the chain of isomorphisms below:

$$\begin{array}{rl} & \Omega_X[d_X] \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X} (\mathscr{K} \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{K})^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \\ \simeq & \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}\!om_{\mathscr{D}_X}(\mathscr{O}_X, (\mathscr{K} \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{K})^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}) \\ \simeq & \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}\!om_{\mathscr{D}_X}(\mathscr{O}_X, (\mathscr{K} \otimes_{f^{-1}\mathscr{O}_Y} f^{-1}\mathscr{D}_Y)^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}) \\ \simeq & \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}\!om_{\mathscr{D}_X}(\mathscr{O}_X, (\mathscr{K} \otimes_{f^{-1}\mathscr{O}_Y} f^{-1}\mathscr{D}_Y))^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \\ \simeq & (((\Omega_X[d_X] \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{D}_X) \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X} \mathscr{K}) \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X} \mathscr{K})^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}. \end{array}$$

We have constructed so far a morphism in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(f^{-1}\mathscr{D}_Y^{\hbar} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}^{\hbar}} f^{-1}\mathscr{D}_Y^{h})$:

$$((\Omega_X[d_X] \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}) \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}} \mathscr{K}_{\hbar}) \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}} \mathscr{K}_{\hbar} \to (((\Omega_X[d_X] \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{D}_X) \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X} \mathscr{K}) \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X} \mathscr{K})^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}.$$

Thus, applying the functor $\mathrm{R}f_!$, Lemma 1.3 and the trace morphism for $\mathscr{D}$-modules, we obtain morphisms in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{D}_Y^{\hbar} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}^{\hbar}} \mathscr{D}_Y^{\hbar})$:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \underline{\underline{f}}_{!,\hbar}(\Omega_X[d_X] \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}) & \to & \mathrm{R}f_!((((\Omega_X[d_X] \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{D}_X) \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X} \mathscr{K}) \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X} \mathscr{K})^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}) \\ & \to & \underline{\underline{f}}_{!}(\Omega_X[d_X] \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{D}_X)^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \\ & \to & (\Omega_Y[d_Y] \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_Y} \mathscr{D}_Y)^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}. \end{array}$$

The conclusion follows from the fact that $\Omega_Y[d_Y]\otimes_{\mathscr{O}_Y}\mathscr{D}_Y$ is a coherent $\mathscr{D}_Y$-module, which yields:

$$(\Omega_Y[d_Y]\otimes_{\mathscr{O}_Y}\mathscr{D}_Y)^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}\simeq\Omega_Y[d_Y]\otimes_{\mathscr{O}_Y}\mathscr{D}_Y^{\hbar}$$

□

Remark 3.17. Consider the absolute case $f=a_X:X\to\{\mathrm{pt}\}$. In this case one has $\mathscr{K}_\hbar\simeq\mathscr{O}_X^{\hbar}$ and we get the following isomorphisms in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}^{\hbar})$:

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{\underline{a_X}}_{!,\hbar}(\Omega_X[d_X]\otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X}\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}) &\simeq \mathrm{R}a_{X!}(\Omega_X[d_X]\overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X}\mathscr{O}_X^{\hbar})\\ &\simeq \mathrm{R}a_{X!}(\mathbb{C}_X^{\hbar}[2d_X])\\ &\simeq \mathrm{R}\Gamma_c(X;\mathbb{C}_X^{\hbar}[2d_X])\simeq\mathrm{R}\Gamma_c(X;\omega_X^{\hbar}).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the trace morphism $\mathrm{tr}_{a_X,\hbar}$ coincides with the integration morphism induced by the adjunction morphism $\mathrm{R}a_{X!}a_X^{!}\to\mathrm{id}$:

$$\int_X:\mathrm{R}\Gamma_c(X,\omega_X^{\hbar})\to\mathbb{C}^{\hbar}.\tag{3.10}$$

The duality morphism.

Proposition 3.18. *For each* $\mathscr{M}\in\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar\,\mathrm{op}})$ *there is a canonical morphism in* $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{D}_Y^{\hbar\,\mathrm{op}})$*:*

$$\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(\underline{\mathrm{D}}_{\hbar,X}\mathscr{M})\to\underline{\mathrm{D}}_{\hbar,Y}(\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}\mathscr{M}).\tag{3.11}$$

Proof. First note that there is a basis change morphism in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{D}_Y^{\hbar\,\mathrm{op}})$:

$$\begin{aligned}&\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(\underline{\mathrm{D}}_{\hbar,X}(\mathscr{M}))\simeq\mathrm{R}f_!(\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}}(\mathscr{M},\Omega_X[d_X]\otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X}\mathscr{K}_\hbar))\\ &\to\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}_Y^{\hbar}}(\mathrm{R}f_!(\mathscr{M}\overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}}\mathscr{K}_\hbar),\mathrm{R}f_!((\Omega_X[d_X]\otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X}\mathscr{K}_\hbar)\overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar}}\mathscr{K}_\hbar))\\ &\simeq\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}_Y^{\hbar}}(\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(\mathscr{M}),\underline{\underline{f}}_{!,\hbar}(\Omega_X[d_X]\otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X}\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar})).\end{aligned}$$

The duality morphism (3.11) is obtained as the composition of the above morphism with the morphism induced by the trace morphism constructed in Proposition 3.16. □

Corollary 3.19. *For* $\mathscr{M}\in\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar\,\mathrm{op}})$ *and* $F\in\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}_X^{\hbar})$*, there is a canonical morphism in* $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{D}_Y^{\hbar\,\mathrm{op}})$*:*

$$\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(\mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}_X^{\hbar}}F\overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}_X^{\hbar}}\underline{\mathrm{D}}_{\hbar,X}(\mathscr{M}))\to\underline{\mathrm{D}}_{\hbar,Y}(\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(F\overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}_X^{\hbar}}\mathscr{M})).\tag{3.12}$$

Proof. We have a canonical morphism in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar\,\mathrm{op}})$:

$$\mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}_X^{\hbar}}F\overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}_X^{\hbar}}\underline{\mathrm{D}}_{\hbar,X}(\mathscr{M})\to\underline{\mathrm{D}}_{\hbar,X}(F\overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}_X^{\hbar}}\mathscr{M}).\tag{3.13}$$

The $\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar$-module structures are induced by $\mathscr{M}$.

The morphism (3.12) is then obtained as the composition:

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(\mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar} F \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar} \underline{\mathrm{D}}_{\hbar,X}(\mathscr{M})) &\to \underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(\underline{\mathrm{D}}_{\hbar,X}(F \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar} \mathscr{M}))\\ &\to \underline{\mathrm{D}}_{\hbar,Y}(\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(F \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar} \mathscr{M})).\end{aligned}$$

The first arrow is induced by (3.13) and the second one results from the duality morphism (3.11) applied to the object $F \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar} \mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}({\mathscr{D}_Y^\hbar}^{\mathrm{op}})$. ☐

Duality theorem.

Theorem 3.20. *Let* $(\mathscr{M}, F)$ *be a good* f*-elliptic pair over* $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$ *and suppose that* f *is proper when restricted to the support of* $(\mathscr{M}, F)$*. Then, the canonical morphism*

$$\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(\mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar} F \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar} \underline{\mathrm{D}}_{\hbar,X}(\mathscr{M})) \to \underline{\mathrm{D}}_{\hbar,Y}(\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(F \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar} \mathscr{M})) \tag{3.14}$$

is an isomorphism in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{gd}}({\mathscr{D}_Y^\hbar}^{\mathrm{op}})$.

Proof. Set $\mathscr{L}_1 = \underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(\mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar} F \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar} \underline{\mathrm{D}}_{\hbar,X}(\mathscr{M}))$ and $\mathscr{L}_2 = \underline{\mathrm{D}}_{\hbar,Y}(\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(F \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar} \mathscr{M}))$.

The f-elliptic pair $(\mathscr{M}, F)$ verifies the conditions of the finiteness theorem 3.9 and it is easy to check that the dual elliptic pair $(\underline{\mathrm{D}}_{\hbar,X}\mathscr{M}, \mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar} F)$ also verifies the same conditions. This allow us to conclude that both $\mathscr{L}_1$ and $\mathscr{L}_2$ are objects of $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{gd}}({\mathscr{D}_Y^\hbar}^{\mathrm{op}})$. Hence, by the conservativity of the graded functor on coherent objects, it suffices to check that the induced morphism $\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{L}_1) \to \mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{L}_2)$ is an isomorphism in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{gd}}(\mathscr{D}_Y^{\mathrm{op}})$.

One has the isomorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{L}_1) &\simeq \underline{f}_!(\mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}_X} \mathrm{gr}_\hbar(F) \otimes \underline{\mathrm{D}}_X(\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{M})))\\ \mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{L}_2) &\simeq \underline{\mathrm{D}}_Y(\underline{f}_!(\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(F) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}_X} \mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{M})))\end{aligned}$$

and, by the construction done, the morphism $\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{L}_1) \to \mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{L}_2)$ is precisely the duality morphism for elliptic pairs over $\mathbb{C}$ applied to the pair $(\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{M}), \mathrm{gr}_\hbar(F))$. Since $(\mathrm{gr}_\hbar \mathscr{M}, \mathrm{gr}_\hbar F)$ is an f-elliptic pair over $\mathbb{C}$ that satisfies the conditions of the duality theorem of [14] (see [14, Theorem 5.15]), we conclude that $\mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{L}_1) \to \mathrm{gr}_\hbar(\mathscr{L}_2)$ is an isomorphism in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{gd}}({\mathscr{D}_Y^\hbar}^{\mathrm{op}})$. ☐

4 Examples and applications

4.1 Finiteness and duality for $\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar$-modules

For each $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}({\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar}^{\mathrm{op}})$, the pair $(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{C}_X^\hbar)$ form an f-elliptic pair over $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$ since $\mathrm{SS}(\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar) = T_X^*X$. Applying Theorems 3.9 and 3.20 in this particular case, we obtain properties of finiteness and duality (in the smooth case) for $\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar$-modules:

Corollary 4.1. *Assume that* $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{gd}}(\mathscr{D}_X^{\hbar\,\mathrm{op}})$ *and that* f *is proper when restricted to* $\mathrm{supp}(\mathscr{M})$*. Then, the objects* $\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(\underline{\mathrm{D}}_{h,X}\mathscr{M})$ *and* $\underline{\mathrm{D}}_{\hbar,Y}(\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(\mathscr{M}))$ *belong to* $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{gd}}(\mathscr{D}_Y^{\hbar\,\mathrm{op}})$*. Assume in addition that* f *is smooth. Then, there is an isomorphism in* $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{gd}}(\mathscr{D}_Y^{\hbar\,\mathrm{op}})$*:*

$$\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(\underline{\mathrm{D}}_{h,X}\mathscr{M}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \underline{\mathrm{D}}_{\hbar,Y}(\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(\mathscr{M})).$$

4.2 Finiteness and duality for $\mathscr{O}_X^\hbar$-modules

Since the ring $\mathscr{O}_X^\hbar$ satisfies hypothesis (1.2.2) and (1.3.1) of [8], all the machinery developed in loc. cit. to study deformation-quantization algebras also apply to the study of $\mathscr{O}_X^\hbar$-modules.

Recall that Gauert's direct image theorem ([2]), states that if f is proper when restricted to the support of $\mathscr{F} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{O}_X)$, then the direct image $\mathrm{R}f_*(\mathscr{F})$ is an object of $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{O}_Y)$.

We can generalize Grauert's theorem to the $\hbar$-framework. Such generalization follows from the classical case and from the coherence criteria [8, Theorem 1.6.4]. We omit further details, since the proof goes like the one of Theorem 3.9.

Theorem 4.2. *Let* $\mathscr{F} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{O}_X^\hbar)$ *and assume that* f *is proper when restricted to* $\mathrm{supp}(\mathscr{F})$*. Then* $\mathrm{R}f_!(\mathscr{F})$ *is an object of* $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{O}_Y^\hbar)$*.*

Recall also the classical results of [12] regarding the relative duality theorem for $\mathscr{O}_X$-modules: first, Ramis-Ruget-Verdier construct a relative trace morphism in the derived category $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{O}_Y)$; then, the trace morphism and Grauert's theorem are used to construct a morphism

$$\mathrm{R}f_!(\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_X}(\mathscr{F}, \Omega_X[d_X])) \to \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_Y}(\mathrm{R}f_!(\mathscr{F}), \Omega_Y[d_Y]),$$

for any $\mathscr{F} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{O}_X)$, and to prove that it is an isomorphism if f is proper on $\mathrm{supp}(\mathscr{F})$.

Assume that one has $f^{-1}\mathscr{O}_X^\hbar \xrightarrow{\sim} (f^{-1}\mathscr{O}_X)^\hbar$. Under such hypothesis, the trace morphism extends to the $\hbar$-framework using Lemma 1.3:

$$\mathrm{R}f_!(\Omega_X^\hbar[d_X]) \to \mathrm{R}f_!(\Omega_X[d_X])^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \to \Omega_Y[d_Y]^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \simeq \Omega_Y^\hbar[d_Y]. \tag{4.1}$$

Therefore, there is a canonical morphism in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{O}_Y^\hbar)$

$$\mathrm{R}f_*(\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_X^\hbar}(\mathscr{F}, \Omega_X^\hbar[d_X]) \to \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_Y^\hbar}(\mathrm{R}f_*(\mathscr{F}), \Omega_Y^\hbar[d_Y]), \tag{4.2}$$

that results from the canonical morphism

$$\mathrm{R}f_*(\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_X^\hbar}(\mathscr{F}, \Omega_X^\hbar[d_X])) \to \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{O}_Y^\hbar}(\mathrm{R}f_!(\mathscr{F}), \mathrm{R}f_!(\Omega_X^\hbar[d_X]))$$

and from (4.1).

Hence we have the counterpart of the relative duality theorem of [12] in the $\hbar$-framework.

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose that* $f^{-1}\mathscr{O}_Y^\hbar \xrightarrow{\sim} (f^{-1}\mathscr{O}_Y)^\hbar$ *and that* f *is proper when restricted to* $\mathrm{supp}(\mathscr{F})$*. Then* (4.2) *is an isomorphism for each* $\mathscr{F} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{O}_X^\hbar)$*.*

To prove this result one uses the conservativity of $\mathrm{gr}_\hbar$ on cohomologically complete objects. We omit again the details of the proof since it repeats arguments already employed.

Note that Theorem 4.3 holds in the smooth case:

Proposition 4.4. *If* $f : X \to Y$ *is a smooth morphism of complex manifolds, then* $f^{-1}\mathscr{O}_X^\hbar \xrightarrow{\sim} (f^{-1}\mathscr{O}_X)^\hbar$*.*

Proof. This is a particular case of Proposition 1.12, choosing $\mathcal{B}$ as the family of open Stein subsets of Y. ☐

Comments 4.5. As Schapira-Schneiders remark in [14], Grauert's theorem and the relative duality theorem for $\mathscr{O}_X$-modules are both recovered as particular cases of their finiteness and duality results applied for elliptic pairs of the form $(\mathscr{F} \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{D}_X, \mathbb{C}_X)$, $\mathscr{F}$ being a coherent $\mathscr{O}_X$-module. This is a consequence of the following two properties:

(i) an $\mathscr{O}_X$-module $\mathscr{F}$ is coherent over $\mathscr{O}_X$ if and only if $\mathscr{F} \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{D}_X$ is coherent over $\mathscr{D}_X$;

(ii) for any $\mathscr{F} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathscr{O}_X)$ one has $\underline{f}_!(\mathscr{F} \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X} \mathscr{D}_X) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{R}f_!(\mathscr{F}) \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_Y} \mathscr{D}_Y$.

Note that for a given $\mathscr{F} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathscr{O}_X^\hbar)$, the pair $(\mathscr{F} \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X^\hbar} \mathscr{D}_X^\hbar, \mathbb{C}_X^\hbar)$ is an f-elliptic pair over $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$. Moreover, we have the counterpart of (i) in the $\hbar$-setting:

(i') a cohomologically complete $\mathscr{O}_X^\hbar$-module $\mathscr{F}$ is coherent over $\mathscr{O}_X^\hbar$ if and only if $\mathscr{F} \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X^\hbar} \mathscr{D}_X^\hbar$ is coherent over $\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar$.

However, since $(\,\bullet\,)^\hbar$ doesn't behave in a nice way under inverse images or tensor products, the relation between $\underline{f}_{!,\hbar}(\mathscr{F} \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X^\hbar} \mathscr{D}_X^\hbar)$ and $\mathrm{R}f_!(\mathscr{F}) \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_Y^\hbar} \mathscr{D}_Y^\hbar$ is not clear. In other words, it is not obvious in what conditions Theorems 3.9 and 3.20 applied to f-elliptic pairs of the form $(\mathscr{F} \otimes_{\mathscr{O}_X^\hbar} \mathscr{D}_X^\hbar, \mathbb{C}_X^\hbar)$ give Theorems 4.2 and 4.3. We remark, however, that this is true if $f = a_X$ is the constant map.

Remark 4.6. Recall that $\mathscr{O}_X^\hbar$ is the natural local model of the deformation-quantization algebras $\mathscr{A}_X$ studied in [8]. Therefore, Theorems 4.2 and 4.3 are closely related to the finiteness and duality results for kernels of $\mathscr{A}_X$-modules proved in loc.cit.. More precisely, the case $f = a_X$ is contained in Corollaries 3.2.3 and 3.3.4 of loc.cit..

4.3 The absolute case: global solutions of $\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar$-modules

From now on we shall consider the absolute case $f = a_X : X \to \{\mathrm{pt}\}$. If we rewrite the morphism of Corollary 3.19 for $f = a_X$ and for left $\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar$-modules, we get, for each pair $(\mathscr{M}, F)$, the morphism below in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}^\hbar)$:

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma_c(X; \Omega_X^\hbar[d_X] \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar} \mathscr{M} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar} F) \to (\mathrm{R}\Gamma_c(X; \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar}(\mathscr{M}, \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar}(F, \mathscr{O}_X^\hbar))))^*. \quad (4.3)$$

Note that the morphism (4.3) is induced by the integration morphism (3.10).

Moreover, as a particular case of Theorems 3.9 and 3.20 we obtain the following corollary:

Corollary 4.7. *Let* $(\mathscr{M}, F)$ *be a good elliptic pair over* $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$ *with compact support. Then, the complexes*

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma_c(X; \Omega_X^\hbar[d_X] \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar} \mathscr{M} \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar} F)$$
$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma_c(X; \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar}(\mathscr{M}, \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar}(F, \mathscr{O}_X^\hbar)))$$

have finitely generated cohomology over $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$ *and the morphism* (4.3) *is an isomorphism in this case.*

One can regard the complex $\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar}(\mathscr{M}, \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar}(F, \mathscr{O}_X^\hbar))$ as the complex of solutions of $\mathscr{M}$ on the generalized sheaf of formal power series of holomorphic functions associated to F. In the last subsection we give an application in a case where the sheaf F is not the constant sheaf $\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar$.

Recall that in [1] the authors prove the constructibility of the complex $\mathrm{Sol}_\hbar(\mathscr{M}) = \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{O}_X^\hbar)$, when $\mathscr{M}$ is an holonomic $\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar$-module (cf. [1, Theorem 3.13]). Applying Corollary 4.7 to elliptic pairs of the form $(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{C}_X^\hbar)$, we also obtain a result concerning the solutions functor $\mathrm{Sol}_\hbar$:

Corollary 4.8. *Let* $\mathscr{M}$ *be a good* $\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar$*-module with compact support. Then,* $\mathrm{R}\Gamma_c(X; \Omega_X[d_X] \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_X} \mathscr{M}) \to \mathrm{R}\Gamma_c(X; \mathrm{Sol}_\hbar(\mathscr{M}))$ *is an isomorphism in* $\mathsf{D}_f^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}^\hbar)$.

The next example illustrates Corollary 4.8 and is based on a formula due to M. Kashiwara (cf. [1, Example 8.5]).

Example 4.9. Consider $X = \mathbb{C}$, $P = x - \hbar\partial_x$ and $\mathscr{M} = \mathscr{D}_X^\hbar / \mathscr{D}_X^\hbar P$. Note that $\mathrm{supp}(\mathscr{M}) = \{0\}$. One knows that $\mathscr{M} \simeq \mathscr{D}_\mathbb{C}^\hbar / \mathscr{D}_\mathbb{C}^\hbar x$. Hence, standard computations lead us to the following quasi-isomorphisms:

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma(\mathbb{C}; \mathrm{Sol}_\hbar(\mathscr{M})) \simeq \mathrm{R}\Gamma(\mathbb{C}; \Omega_\mathbb{C}^\hbar[1] \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}_\mathbb{C}^\hbar} \mathscr{M}) \simeq \mathbb{C}^\hbar.$$

Remark 4.10. For each $F \in \mathsf{D}_{\mathbb{R}-\mathrm{c}}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar)$, the pair $(\mathscr{O}_X^\hbar, F)$ is an elliptic pair over $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$, since $\mathrm{char}_\hbar(\mathscr{O}_X^\hbar) = T_X^*X$. Moreover, Corollary 4.7 applied to elliptic pairs of this form gives a well-known finiteness and duality result for $\mathbb{R}$-constructible sheaves of $\mathbb{C}^\hbar$-modules.

A refinement in the holonomic case.

Lemma 4.11. (a) *For* $F \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar)$ *and* V *an open subset of* X*, one has*

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma(V; \mathrm{D}_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar} F) \simeq (\mathrm{R}\Gamma_c(V; F))^*.$$

(b) *If $F \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{R}-\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{C}^{\hbar}_X)$ and V is a relatively compact open subanalytic subset of X, then both $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(V; \mathrm{D}_{\mathbb{C}^{\hbar}_X} F)$ and $\mathrm{R}\Gamma_c(V; F)$ have finitely generated cohomology over $\mathbb{C}^{\hbar}$ and the isomorphism in (a) holds in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_f(\mathbb{C}^{\hbar})$.*

Proof. The isomorphism in (a) follows from formula [6, (3.1.8)] with $A = \mathbb{C}^{\hbar}$. The finiteness property in (b) is a consequence of [6, Corollary 8.4.11]. □

Given $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{hol}}(\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X)$, we can apply Lemma 4.11 with F replaced by $\mathrm{Sol}_{\hbar}(\mathscr{M})$:

Proposition 4.12. *Let $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{hol}}(\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X)$ and V be a relatively compact open subanalytic subset of X. Then, $\mathrm{R}\Gamma_c(V; \mathrm{Sol}_{\hbar}(\mathscr{M})$ is an object in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_f(\mathbb{C}^{\hbar})$ and, moreover, there is an isomorphism in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_f(\mathbb{C}^{\hbar})$:*

$$\mathrm{R}\Gamma(V; \Omega^{\hbar}_X[d_X] \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X} \mathscr{M}) \simeq (\mathrm{R}\Gamma_c(V; \mathrm{Sol}_{\hbar}(\mathscr{M})))^*.$$

Proof. This is a direct application of Lemma 4.11, using also the isomorphism:

$$\mathrm{D}_{\mathbb{C}^{\hbar}_X} \mathrm{Sol}_{\hbar}(\mathscr{M}) \simeq \Omega^{\hbar}_X[d_X] \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X} \mathscr{M},$$

which follows from [1, Theorem 3.15]. □

Let us illustrate Proposition 4.12 with some examples:

Example 4.13. Consider $X = \mathbb{C}$, $P = x\partial_x - \lambda\hbar$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^{\star}$, and $\mathscr{M} = \mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X / \mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X P$. Let V be an open simply connected subset of $\mathbb{C}$. In this situation, we have $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(V; \mathrm{Sol}_{\hbar}(\mathscr{M})) \simeq \mathbb{C}^{\hbar}[-1]$ if $0 \notin V$, and $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(V; \mathrm{Sol}_{\hbar}(\mathscr{M})) \simeq \mathbb{C}$ otherwise. Let us give some details of the computations.

First note that an equation of the form $Pu = g$ is equivalent to the following infinite system of linear holomorphic differential equations:

$$\begin{cases} x\partial_x u_0 = g_0, \\ x\partial_x u_n - \lambda u_{n-1} = g_n, \quad n \geq 1. \end{cases} \tag{4.4}$$

If $0 \notin V$, then the solutions of the homogeneous equation $Pu = 0$ are given recursively by

$$u_n = \sum_{j=0}^{n} a_{n-j} \lambda^j \frac{\log(x)^j}{j!} \hbar^j, \quad a_0, \ldots, a_n \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Hence, each solution is determined by the family of constants $(a_n)_{n \geq 0}$ and we get $\mathrm{Ker}(P) \simeq \mathbb{C}^{\hbar}$. On the other hand, $\mathrm{Coker}(P) = 0$ since, recursively, the Cauchy theorem guarantees that, for each $n \geq 0$, there is a solution $u_n \in \Gamma(V; \mathscr{O}_X)$ of the nth-equation and then the formal series $u = \sum_n u_n \hbar^n \in \Gamma(V; \mathscr{O}^{\hbar}_X)$ solves $Pu = g$.

If $0 \in V$, it is obvious that $\mathrm{Ker}(P) = 0$. On the other hand, $\mathrm{Coker}(P) \simeq \mathbb{C}$. Indeed, there is a solution of the nth-equation of (4.4) if and only if we have $g_0(0) \neq 0$. Moreover $f = \sum f_n \hbar^n \in \Gamma(V; \mathscr{O}^{\hbar}_X)$ and $g = \sum g_n \hbar^n \in \Gamma(V; \mathscr{O}^{\hbar}_X)$ determine the same element in $\mathrm{Coker}(P)$ if and only if $f_0(0) = g_0(0)$, and the conclusion follows.

Example 4.14. Consider $X = \mathbb{C}$, $P = x^2\partial_x + \lambda\hbar$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^\star$, and $\mathscr{M} = \mathscr{D}_X^\hbar/\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar P$. Let V be an open simply connected subset of $\mathbb{C}$. Then, we have $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(V;\mathrm{Sol}_\hbar(\mathscr{M})) \simeq \mathbb{C}^\hbar[-1]$ if $0 \notin V$, and $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(V;\mathrm{Sol}_\hbar(\mathscr{M})) \simeq \mathbb{C}^2$ otherwise. We omit the computations, since they are similar to those of Example 4.13. Let us just remark that in the case $0 \notin V$, the solutions $u = (u_n)_{n\geq 0} \in \Gamma(V;\mathscr{O}_X^\hbar)$ of $Pu = 0$ are recursively given by:

$$u_n = \sum_{j=0}^{n} a_{n-j}\frac{\lambda^j}{j!x^j}\hbar^j, \quad a_0,\ldots,a_n \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Example 4.15. Consider $X = \mathbb{C}^2$, $P = (x-\lambda\hbar)\partial_y$, with $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, $\mathscr{M} = \mathscr{D}_X^\hbar/\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar P$ and let V be an open subset of X. The finiteness property doesn't hold in this non-holonomic case. Indeed, the kernel of $\Gamma(V;\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{C}^2}^\hbar \xrightarrow{P} \Gamma(V;\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{C}^2}^\hbar)$ consists on holomorphic functions which don't depend on y, thus it is isomorphic to $\Gamma(V;\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{C}}^\hbar)$.

4.4 Hyperfunctions with $\hbar$-parameter

Let X be the complexification of a real analytic manifold M and let $\mathscr{A}_M := \mathbb{C}_M \otimes \mathscr{O}_X$ denote the sheaf of real analytic functions on M. In the $\hbar$-framework we can consider two distinct sheaves of real analytic manifolds with $\hbar$-parameter, denoted by $\mathscr{A}_{M,\hbar}$ and $\mathscr{A}_M^\hbar$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathscr{A}_{M,\hbar} := \mathbb{C}_M^\hbar \otimes_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar} \mathscr{O}_X^\hbar \simeq \mathbb{C}_M \otimes \mathscr{O}_X^\hbar,\\
&\mathscr{A}_M^\hbar = (\mathbb{C}_M \otimes \mathscr{O}_X)^\hbar.
\end{aligned}$$

One has the isomorphism $\mathscr{A}_M^\hbar \simeq \mathscr{A}_M^{\mathrm{R}\hbar}$, since $\mathscr{A}_M$ verifies the hypothesis of Proposition 1.2 taking for $\mathcal{B}$ the family of all open subsets of M. Hence, both $\mathscr{A}_{M,\hbar}$ and $\mathscr{A}_M^\hbar$ are concentrated in degree 0 and we can identify them to usual sheaves.

Similarly to Example 3.12, one concludes that there is a natural monomorpism $\mathscr{A}_{M,\hbar} \hookrightarrow \mathscr{A}_M^\hbar$ in $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathscr{D}_X^\hbar)$ which is not an epimorphism. Moreover, we remark that this morphism is a particular case of the morphism constructed in Lemma 3.4.

Let us also consider the c-soft sheaf of hyperfunctions on M, defined by $\mathscr{B}_M := \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathbb{C}_X}(\mathbb{C}_M, \mathscr{M})$. The formal extension of $\mathscr{B}_M$ verifies the following isomorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{B}_M^{\mathrm{R}\hbar} \simeq \mathscr{B}_M^\hbar &= (\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om\,(\mathrm{D}'\mathbb{C}_M, \mathscr{O}_X))^\hbar\\
&\simeq \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om\,(\mathrm{D}'\mathbb{C}_M, \mathscr{O}_X^\hbar),\\
&\simeq \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar}(\mathrm{D}'_{\mathbb{C}_X^\hbar}\mathbb{C}_M^\hbar, \mathscr{O}_X^\hbar).
\end{aligned}$$

Let us remark that $\mathscr{B}_M$ is $\hbar$-acyclic by Proposition 1.2 and by the fact that c-soft objects are $\Gamma(K;\_)$-injective, for any compact $K \subset X$. We say that $\mathscr{B}_M^\hbar$ is the sheaf of hyperfunctions on M with $\hbar$-parameter.

As a particular case of Lemma 3.5, we get the following commutative diagram of morphisms in $\mathrm{Mod}(\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X)$:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathscr{A}_{M,\hbar} \arrow[r] \arrow[dr] & \mathscr{A}^{\hbar}_M \arrow[d] \\
 & \mathscr{B}^{\hbar}_M
\end{tikzcd}$$

Let $\mathscr{M}$ be a coherent $\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X$-module. Recall that we say that $\mathscr{M}$ is elliptic on M if $(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{C}^{\hbar}_M)$ is an elliptic pair over $\mathbb{C}^{\hbar}$, cf. Definition 2.22. Applying our main results to elliptic pairs of the form $(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{C}^{\hbar}_M)$, we obtain the following regularity, finiteness and duality property for elliptic $\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X$-modules.

Corollary 4.16. *Let $\mathscr{M}$ be an elliptic $\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X$-module on M.*

(a) *There is a commutative diagram of isomorphisms in $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{C}^{\hbar}_X)$:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{A}_{M,\hbar}) \arrow[r, "\sim"] \arrow[dr, "\sim"] & \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{A}^{\hbar}_M) \arrow[d, "\sim"] \\
 & \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{B}^{\hbar}_M).
\end{tikzcd}$$

(b) *If M is compact and $\mathscr{M} \in \mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{gd}}(\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_X)$, then $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(M; \Omega^{\hbar}_M \overset{\mathrm{L}}{\otimes}_{\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_M} \mathscr{M})$ is the dual of $\mathrm{R}\Gamma(M; \mathrm{R}\mathscr{H}om_{\mathscr{D}^{\hbar}_M}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{B}_{M,\hbar}))$ and both objects belong to $\mathsf{D}^{\mathrm{b}}_f(\mathbb{C}^{\hbar})$.*

References

[1] A. D'Agnolo, S. Guillermou and P. Schapira, *Regular holonomic $\mathscr{D}[[\hbar]]$-modules,* Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ. **47** no. 1, (2011), p. 221-255.

[2] H. Grauert, *Ein Theorem der analytischen Garbentheorie und die Modulräume komplexer Strukturen,* Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math, **5** (1960), p. 233-292.

[3] M. Kashiwara, *Systems of microdifferential equations,* Progress in Mathematics, **34**, Birkhäuser (1983).

[4] ———, *The Riemman-Hilbert problem for holonomic systems,* Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ. **20** (1984), p. 319-365.

[5] ———, *$\mathscr{D}$-modules and Microlocal Calculus,* Translations of Mathematical Monographs, **217** American Math. Soc. (2003).

[6] M. Kashiwara and P. Schapira, *Sheaves On Manifolds,* Grundlehren der Math. Wiss. **292** Springer-Verlag (1990).

[7] ———, *Moderate and formal cohomology associated with constructible sheaves,* Mem. Soc. Math. France **64** (1996).

[8] ———, *Deformation Quantization Modules,* to appear in Asterisque, Soc. Math. France (2012), `arXiv:1003.3304v3`

[9] A.R. Martins and T. Monteiro Fernandes, *Formal extension of the Whitney functor and duality,* Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico della Università di Padova, **126** (2011).

[10] A.R. Martins, T.Monteiro Fernandes and D. Raimundo, *Extension of functors for algebras of formal deformation,* submitted `arXiv:1201.0536v2`

[11] Z. Mebkhout, *Le formalisme des six opérations de Grothendieck pour les* $\mathscr{D}_X$*-modules cohérents,* Travaux em Cours, **35**, Hermann (1989).

[12] J. P. Ramis, G. Ruget, and J. L. Verdier, *Dualité relative en geométrie analytique complexe,* Invent. Math. **13** (1971), p. 261-283.

[13] P. Schapira, *Microdifferential systems in the complex domain*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, **269**, Springer, (1985).

[14] P. Schapira and J-P. Schneiders, *Elliptic pairs I: relative finiteness and duality,* Astérisque Soc. Math. France, **224** (1994).

David Raimundo
Centro de Matemática e Aplicações Fundamentais da Universidade de Lisboa,
Departamento de Matemática, FCUL,
Edifício C6, piso 2, Campo Grande
1749-16, Lisboa, Portugal
`dsraimundo@fc.ul.pt`